

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Samuel Der-Yeghiayan	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	11 C 2334	DATE	9/12/2012
CASE TITLE	Zafar Sheikh vs. Marc Lichtman, et al.		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below, Plaintiff's motion to compel [102] is denied and Plaintiff's motion to extend discovery cutoff date [103] is denied. Noticed motion date of 09/13/12 is stricken. All other dates previously set by the court remain unchanged.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff Zafar Sheikh's (Sheikh) motion to compel and motion to extend the discovery cut-off date for another sixty days. In his motion to compel, Sheikh requests an order compelling City Defendant to furnish documents, instead of CDs containing electronic documents, and provide "non-evasive" answers to Sheikh's interrogatories. The record before this court indicates that City Defendants have complied with their discovery obligations. Sheikh elected to prosecute this matter *pro se* and at no time did he file a motion for an appointment of counsel. As the court has indicated to Sheikh on numerous occasions, Sheikh must abide by the rules and procedures of this court regardless of his *pro se* status. Providing Sheikh with CDs containing electronic documents is entirely permissible, and the City Defendants have indicated that they ensured that the formats of the documents on the CDs are such that the documents are readily accessible to Sheikh. In addition, Sheikh's characterization of City Defendants' responses to Sheikh's interrogatories as "evasive" is not supported by the record. Therefore, Sheikh has not provided sufficient justification to warrant granting his motion to compel.

Sheikh has also requested an extension of the discovery deadlines for another 60 days. The record reflects that on April 19, 2012, the court gave the parties five months to complete fact discovery in this case,

STATEMENT

which does not appear to be factually or legally complex. Also, the court has dismissed certain defendants and certain claims, thus narrowing the scope of discovery needed. On August 14, 2012, the court extended discovery until October 15, 2012, even though the City Defendants correctly argued that it was Sheikh who had delayed discovery, in part because Sheikh had been out of the country for a certain duration during the discovery period. As discussed above, City Defendants have timely complied with their discovery obligations. Sheikh has not provided sufficient justification to warrant a further extension of the discovery deadline of October 15, 2012. Therefore, Sheikh's motion to extend discovery is denied. All dates previously set by the court remain unchanged.